UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,217	08/31/2006	Jean-Stephane Villers	11345/120001	6998

22511   7590   09/03/2009
OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
TWO HOUSTON CENTER
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, HAU H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/531,217	VILLERS, JEAN-STEPHANE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	HAU H. NGUYEN	2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2005*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.
      4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
      * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/14/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/14/2005 was considered by

the examiner.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1 and 7

claim the following features:

"a step of copying the content of the pixmaps into the display window *with previously if*

necessary a step forcing the updating of the pixmaps involved in the display if the previous step

has not terminated *same*", which is not clear to the examiner what is actually claimed, i.e. what is

necessary, or what the *previous step* is, or what the *same* step is. In the following rejection, claim

language is interpreted as best understood by the examiner. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashe (U.S. Patent

No. 5,900,872).

As per claim 1, Ashe teaches a method of displaying a document on a display screen capable of being subjected to a scroll procedure (col. 1, lines 10-16), comprising the following steps: :

a step of allocating the document a quantity of graphics memory so as to create a buffer memory of the visible part of the document and of the zones closest to this visible part and referred to as anticipation bands (Fig. 6A, steps 66-70, and col. 5, lines 24-42, see also col. 4, lines 29-49);

a step of calculating and of chopping of this memory into pixmaps as a function of the size of the document, of the visible part, and of those of the anticipation bands (col. 5, lines 30-54, see also col. 1, lines 30-38),

a step of relative positioning of these pixmaps with respect to the complete document and its visible part, a step, that can be carried out as a background task, of filling the content of the pixmaps with a priority system dependent on the proximity of the pixmap with respect to the visible zone, when the document is subjected to a display procedure or to a scrolling (Fig. 6A-6B, col. 6, lines 41-46),

a step of copying the content of the pixmaps into the display window with previously if necessary a step forcing the updating of the pixmaps involved in the display if the previous step has not terminated same (see claim objection above, moving and updating display contents into the display window, see col. 4, lines 29-49);

return to the step of relative positioning of the pixmaps with respect to the documents as a function of the new position of the visible part (col. 6, lines 40-67).

As per claim 2, Ashe teaches wherein the anticipation bands comprise a minimum of one column of pixmaps on the right and on the left of the visible window as well as a row of pixmaps at the bottom and at the top, except in the case where the visible window approaches the edge of the document (as cited above, see col. 4, lines 29-49).

As per claim 3, Ashe also teaches the pixmaps are chopped into rectangles which are drawn successively with each call of a background task (as cited above, col. 5, lines 29-54).

As per claim 4, as cited above, Ashe teaches the background task also has the function of constructing the anticipation bands (Figs. 6A-6B, col. 5, lines 29-54, and col. 6, lines 41-67).

As per claim 5, as previously stated, Ashe teaches each call of this background task, comprises: reorganization of the pixmaps if a scroll has been performed (see the housekeeping step of tracking regions in the memory, col. 5, lines 29-54), if no repositioning of the pixmaps has occurred, drawing of the first rectangle of a pixmap determined as a function of a criterion of distance away from the visible zone of the document (see also col. 6, lines 1-31).

As per claim 6, Ashe inherently teaches using a synchronization mechanism allowing the possible forcing of the data to be displayed into the pixmaps (so as to avoid the flickering, col. 1, lines 61-67).

As per claim 7, Ashe teaches an immediate drawing is carried out in two cases: when an "expose" event compels the drawing of a part of the display window though this part has not yet been drawn in the anticipation bands, or when an element of the document is modified graphically in the display window (preparation of the next iteration, col. 7, lines 1-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe (U.S. Patent

No. 5,900,872).

        As per claim 8, although Ashe does not explicitly teach the document is a HyperText

Markup Language (HTML) document, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to

utilize the method of scrolling a document in which the document is an HTML document since it

is well known in the art to create an HTML document for a web page.

7.   Claim 9-16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe (U.S.

Patent No. 5,900,872) in view of Parthasarathy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,802,061,

"Parthasarathy", hereinafter).

        As per claim 9, the scope of which is similar to claim 1 as addressed above, further

requires a digital television decoder for displaying a document on a display screen. However, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by Ashe to

incorporate into a digital television decoder, such as a set-top box to provide an interface with

television. One of such is disclosed in Parthasarathy, which teaches a method of scrolling a

document and also utilizes a set-top box for interfacing with a television (col. 29, lines 1-11).

        Claim 10, which is similar in scope to claim 2, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 11, which is similar in scope to claim 3, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 12, which is similar in scope to claim 4, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 13, which is similar in scope to claim 5, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 14, which is similar in scope to claim 6, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15, which is similar in scope to claim 7, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 16, although not explicitly taught by Ashe, Parthasarathy teaches the document is

an HTML. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method of

scrolling a document in which the document is an HTML document since it is well known in the

art to create an HTML document for a web page.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-7787. The

examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794.

 The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hau H Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628